



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,976	11/19/2003	Qm Almarsoo	MCN-5003-USCNT2	7561
27777	7590	03/28/2007	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			MCINTOSH III, TRAVISS C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,976	ALMARSSOO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Traviss C. McIntosh	1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 62-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 62-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 65 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment filed 1/3/2007 has been received, entered into the record, and carefully considered. The following information provided in the amendment affects the instant application by:

Claim 64 has been amended.

Claims 1-61 and 66-68 have been canceled.

Remarks drawn to rejections of Office Action mailed 9/6/2006 include:

Double Patenting Rejections: which have been overcome by applicant's filing of terminal disclaimers and have been withdrawn.

An action on the merits of claims 62-65 is contained herein below. The text of those sections of Title 35, US Code which are not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatt et al. (US 6,368,626) in view of Cutler (US 2003/0072802 A1).

Claims 62-63 of the instant application are drawn to pharmaceutical dosages having various wall defining cavities, exit orifices, etc., wherein the drug layer comprises a salt of topiramate, or a polymorph, solvate, hydrate, dehydrate, co-crystal, anhydrous, or amorphous form thereof. Claim 64 provides the topiramate is a salt of lithium, potassium, or sodium.

Bhatt et al. disclose the pharmaceutical dosage form as set forth in the instant claims, with the same wall defining cavities, exit orifices, etc. What is not taught is to include salts of topiramate as the drug to be used for delayed release.

Cutler teaches that topiramate salts are effective in controlled or delayed release formulations (see [0007]). Cutler also teaches the delayed release formulation comprises a salt of topiramate (see claim 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the topiramate salts of Cutler to the delayed release dosage form of Bhatt et al. with these references before them. Bhatt et al. teach that their dosage form can be used for delayed release to a wide variety of drugs (see columns 7-8), and Cutler teaches the need for a controlled release

dosage form of topiramate salts. One would have been motivated to use the dosage form of Bhatt for delivering the topiramate salts of Cutler because Cutler teaches that their delayed release dosages should be released over a period of about 1-12 hours, or more particularly over a period of about 4-8 hours and figure 2 of Bhatt et al. shows their dosage forms deliver drugs over a period of at least 1-12 hours, with maximum delivery at 4-8 hours.

Conclusion

Claim 65 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art is not seen to teach or fairly suggest the use of the specific topiramate sodium trihydrate salt in the dosage form claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Traviss C. McIntosh whose telephone number is 571-272-0657. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia A. Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Traviss McIntosh
March 18, 2007

Shaojia A. Jiang
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1623

Leigh C. Maier
LEIGH C. MAIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER